

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application, in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The examiner objects to the disclosure because the brief summary of the invention is missing.

In actuality, the summary of the invention section is present as paragraphs 18-21 which are inappropriately labeled. Accordingly, Applicants have changed the title "DETAILED DESCRIPTION" to –Summary of the Invention—and deleted paragraph 17. The title –Detailed Description-- has been inserted before paragraph 22 and paragraph 22 has been deleted. Although the brief description of the invention will now be out of the preferred order of the specification, the preferred order is just that, it is an order preferred by Office, by not required by the statute.

The examiner objects to Claims 5 and 11 because of the recitation of "said first cell" having insufficient antecedent basis in the claim. Applicants have taken the examiner's suggestion of eliminating the word "first".

The examiner objects to Claim 6 because the meaning of the term "characterized" found on line 8 lacks clarity with the specification. Applicants disagree, since the language "characterized for hold time violation" is clearly described in paragraph 0041 of the present application.

The examiner objects to Claim 5 because the meaning of preamble is unclear. Again, Applicants disagree since the term "offered loads" appears as described in paragraph 0034 in the present application and therefore clear in Claim 5.

The examiner objects to Claim 12 because the meaning of the term "characterized" found on line 9 lacks clarity. Applicants refer the examiner to the comments regarding Claim 6.

The examiner rejects Claims 1, 2, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Salem et al. The examiner states that Salem teaches a method and machine readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions to determine whether an integrated circuit operates at a clock speed where the integrated circuit compromises a combinatorial element where the execution of one or more sequences of instructions by one or more processors contained in the system causes said one or

more processors to perform the actions of and the method of comprising determining a load offered by the combinatorial element when the output path of said combinatorial element switches in response to a vector provided as an input to said combinatorial element.

We cannot agree. Nothing in Salem et al shows or suggests the utilization of a different load for combinatorial element when the output path switches in response to vector. That is, it determines a load associated with the gate and rise time selected for the gate and interpolates that value with other data from a “grid of points” in order to get a more accurate result. However, nothing shows or suggests that these results vary upon whether or not the combinatorial element is made to switch or not. In view of fact that feature is already disclosed in Claims 1 and 7 and that Claims 2 and 8 are dependent from Claims 1 and 7, respectfully, then claims are already clearly distinguished from this reference, and no changes to the claims have been made in view of this reference.

The examiner rejects Claims 3, 4, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salem et al. It is noted that Claims 3 and 4 are dependent indirectly from Claim 1 and that Claims 8 and 9 are dependent directly or indirectly from Claim 7. The patentability of Claims 1 and 7 have been shown above, these claims are patentable for the same reasons.

The examiner rejects Claims 5, 6, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salem et al. in view of Sun et al and in further view of Van Brunt. The examiner states that Salem does not teach the relationship between a changing propagation time and setup/hold time violations. The examiner states that Sun teaches a relationship between a changing propagation time and setup/hold time violations but does not teach determining a first set of input vectors that would cause an output path of a combinatorial element to switch where the combinatorial element is contained to the first cell connected to an input pin. The examiner states that Van Brunt teaches determining a first set of input vectors that would cause an output path of a combinatorial element to switch and specifically refers to Col 9, lines 43-69. The examiner concludes that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Sun and Van Brunt into the invention of Salem because Sun improves the

invention of Salem by giving consideration to hold time and setup time violations that may be created by gate propagation delays that are either too short or too long and Van Brunt improves the invention by Salem by providing a method for which to determine which input values cause a gate to switch states in response to a signal change at input pins.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Assuming, arguendo that Salem et al and Sun can be combined, there still would be no showing or suggestion that the capacitor measured at the pin changes when the combinatorial element switches which causes changes in the characterization of setup time violation. Van Brunt at Col 9 only discusses the preparation of a truth table for the gate elements, which are well known in the art. Nothing in the combination of these three references shows or even suggests that the capacitor values be taken in consideration from the switching of the combinatorial element, which then changes the value when characterizing the pin for setup time violation, the examiner statements to the contrary notwithstanding.

In addition to the changes requested by the examiner to the specification, some changes have been made to correct typographical errors and to eliminate some paragraphs such a paragraph 0017 and 0022. The elimination of these paragraphs also caused the numbers in paragraphs 0028, 0035, 0047 and 0053 to be incorrect, so they have been deleted. An obvious typographical error in paragraph in 0032 has also been corrected. In addition, this same typographical error has been corrected in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants believe that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Texas Instruments Incorporated

/William B Kempler/
William B. Kempler
Senior Corporate Patent Counsel
Reg. No. 28,228
Tel.: (972) 917-5452